



Consultant Selection

Interview Process

Pilot Program

Implemented April 23, 2003

Updated March 25, 2004

New Consultant Selection Interview Process

Pilot Program Update 3/24/04

Introduction

In April 2003 UDOT implemented a Pilot Program to test the new Consultant Selection Interview Process developed by a Quality Improvement Team (CSIPT), see the UDOT Website udot.utah.gov under "Inside UDOT > Internal Groups and Divisions > Project Development > Consultant Services > Other Consultant Services Related Information" or udot.utah.gov/index.php/m=c/tid=616/item=2432/d=full/type=1 for more details.

There have been four sets of consultant selection interviews conducted to date.

Projects in the Pilot Program

Interviews	Date	Project No.	Location
1 st Set	12/10/03	IM-NH-15-6(149)245E	I-15 Corridor, Santaquin to Salt Lake County
2 nd Set	2/6/04	SP-0089(87)316E	State Street, 8000 S. to 7800 S., TRAX Bridge
3 rd Set	2/12/04	SP-0010(21)64E	Corridor Study on SR-10, Stake Farm Road to SR-6
4 th Set	3/18/04	STP-0012(8)60E	SR-12, Escalante to Boulder

Changes to Old Interview Process

As part of the Pilot Program there were four main changes made to the interview process. They are as follows:

- Increased flexibility of format for the Selection Team (*Interview Format Worksheet Form*)
 - Short Presentation is an option to Selection Team
 - Time allotments may vary
 - Weights of sections may vary
 - Visual aids allowed may vary
 - Releasing or not releasing Strengths & Weaknesses from SOQ's
- Choosing-By-Advantage Scoring process has been replaced by the "New Scoring Process"
 - Score consultants' responses to questions
 - Identify both strengths and weaknesses

- Statement of Qualifications score is carried forward as a percentage of the consultant selection's Final Score
 - 30% was set for life of Pilot Program
- Requesting consultants prepare a Short Presentation is an option to Selection Teams

Interim Changes to Pilot Program

In the past year of the Pilot Program, there has been some fine-tuning of the process. Generally, the changes are in regards to:

- Visual aids possible;
- Scoring process; and,
- Length of time possible for optional Short Presentation.

What now?

The next step is to conclude the Pilot Program and implement the changes officially. The CSIPT Team will meet in April and May 2004 to complete their task; i.e.,

- Review feedback received from participants of the Pilot Program;
- Review/refine the interim changes to process;
- Review/refine format of forms; and,
- Review proposed changes to the UDOT Consultant Services Manual of Instructions incorporating the new process.

There is still a short window of opportunity to submit your comments regarding the process. Jon Nepstad from Fehr & Peers is the ACEC representative on the CSIPT. His contact information is, phone 801-261-4700, email j.nepstad@fehrandpeers.com.

UDOT anticipates final approval of the new process in June or July of 2004.

UDOT Consultant Services

RFQ Consultant Selection Process

Overview

Section A (Remains the same)

- Hold Scoping Meeting
- Advertise Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in newspapers
- Post RFQ on UDOT Website
- Advertise RFQ in newspapers
- Consultants submit Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's).
- Selection Team scores & develops debriefing comments on SOQ's.
- UDOT Consultant Services compiles scores & comments.

Section B (Revised as part of the Pilot Program)

- Hold Selection Team Meeting
 - Decide whether interviews are needed based on point spreads.
 - Determine short-list of consultants to be interviewed
 - Develop interview format (*Interview Format Worksheet Form*)
- Notify consultants of results of Selection Team Meeting (*Letter of Interview Instructions*)
- Conduct interviews
- After each interview - Individual Selection Team members score and document their debriefing comments (Based on format recommend by ACEC for SOQ's – three strengths, three weaknesses, and any additional comments)
- Selection Team's Agenda just after interviews
 - Open Team discussion of Consultant Teams' teams, philosophies, approaches, and strengths & weaknesses
 - Score as a Team by consensus
 - "Short Presentation" (optional)
 - Each response to questions; and,
 - Summation & Comment.
 - Develop as a Team by consensus debriefing comments for consultants
 - Develop final ranking of consultants
- Notify consultants of results of interviews
- Negotiate contract
- If UDOT cannot come to an agreement with first-ranked firm, then negotiations are terminated with that firm and UDOT enters negotiations with second ranked firm.

Consultant Selection Interview Process

Pilot Program

Interim Changes

Based on observations by Consultant Services staff and from feedback from participants in the Pilot Program the following interim changes have been made to the Consultant Selection Interview Process Pilot Program.

Short Presentation

Change: If a Selection Team decides to allow a Short Presentation, the minimum time length is 10 minutes.

Implemented: After 1st set of interviews

Reason: Five minutes just wasn't long enough for anything substantive. Most consultants used the time basically as an introduction and many of the Selection Team members felt it didn't really add anything because it was too short.

Change: Eliminated the "Follow Up / Clarification to Short Presentation" Section.

Implemented: After 3rd set of interviews

Reason: In the three sets of interviews we offered this option, no one really used it. If a consultant is unclear in their Short Presentation then they should be scored lower.

Scoring

Change: Expanded score-sheets to allow the Selection Team to average their tentative scores as a starting point for the consensus discussion and scoring of consultants' responses to questions and the Short Presentation.

Implemented: After 1st set of interviews

Reason: The Selection Team being mostly engineers, requested this information.

Change: Associated descriptive words to the 0-10 scores.

Extraordinary	10	
Excellent	9	
Very Good	8	
Good	7	
Average	6	
Acceptable	5	
Barely Acceptable	4	
Unacceptable	3	
Poor	2	
Very Poor	1	
Non-existent	0	(Didn't Complete Section)

Implemented: After 3rd set of interviews, revised after 4th Set

Reason: There have been complaints in various Selection Team meetings and especially after the second set of interviews about Selection Team members' various

preconceived notions of what score relates to acceptable and what score relates to poor, etc.

Conflict-of-Interest

Change: Individuals are not allowed to interview on more than one Consultant Team.

Implemented: After 1st set of interviews

Reason: This situation gives the appearance of the opportunity for a conflict-of-interest. The individual could taint the process by slanting the interview towards one consultant team or another. They could relay the questions prior to the interview to the second consultant team.

Visual Aids

Change: Require consultants to duplicate pre-prepared boards in handouts.

Implemented: After 1st set of interviews

Reason: As consultants try to optimize their use of space on the boards, the font is too small for some to see.

Change: Limit handouts to duplication of pre-prepared boards.

Implemented: After 3rd set of interviews

Reason: Handouts can be distracting and consultants spend a lot of time and money on these when they can't really use them too much.

Change: Visible display clock for consultants

Implemented: After 3rd set of interviews

Reason: Consultants are able to see for themselves how much time is left whenever they choose to look. In addition, it was recommended by a couple of Selection Team members.

Visual Aid Clarification to Consultants Implemented Prior to 1st Set of Interviews

Question: "May we use one or more of the three allowed pre-prepared presentation boards, or any of the other visual aids, during the Question and Answer portion of the interview instead of the Short Presentation?"

Answer: "Yes, you may."

Question: "If we enlarge graphics from our SOQ does that count towards the three boards?"

Answer: "Yes, and the size requirement applies too."

Question: "May the three boards be used on both sides?"

Answer: "A board with information on two sides will count as two boards."

Question: "May we bring more than three boards if we only use three?"

Answer: "No."

Question: "May we refer the interviewers to graphics within our SOQ?"

Answer: "Yes. You may want to bring along a couple of extra copies of your SOQ's just in case."

Question: "If we prepare handouts, will we be able to leave them with the interviewers for reference later?"

Answer: "No. I will ask for one copy of your handout for my files but the rest will be returned to you at the end of the interview. The purpose of allowing hand-outs is for reference during the interview not to have further reviewing for interviewers after the interview is over."

UDOT Consultant Selection

Interview Process Pilot Program

Feedback Request Form

Background Information

1. Your Name and/or Firm Name (Optional) _____
2. How many UDOT Engineering Services consultant selection interviews have you participated in prior to this one? (If you're not sure, please estimate.)
3. During this interview process, were you a Consultant Interview Team member or a UDOT Selection Team member?

General (Training, Ease of Use, Effective)

4. Please rate in general on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the best or excellent, this new process.
5. Is the new process easy to use and understand? (Score 0-10)
6. Were you given enough training on the new process before or while you were going through it? (Score 0-10)
7. What do you think is the largest stumbling block in this new process?

Statements of Qualifications in Final Score

8. Do you think including the scores of Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's) as a percentage of the final score is appropriate?
9. Do you think 30% is the appropriate weight for the SOQ's? If not, what percentage do you recommend?

Please return this form to:
Gaye Hettrick
UDOT Consultant Services
Fax 801-965-4796

Page 1 of 2

UDOT Consultant Selection

Interview Process Pilot Program

Feedback Request Form

Short Presentation

10. Do you think offering the opportunity to Consultants to give a Short Presentation is a positive? Did it help you decide which Consultant is the best qualified?

Visual Aids

11. Do you think allowing visual aids in the interviews is a positive? Do you recommend continuing to allow it?

CBA vs Scoring Questions

12. Do you think scoring each Consultant's answers is an improvement over the Choosing-By-Advantage method? If not, what other scoring method do you recommend?

Overall

13. What changes or improvements do you recommend, if any?
14. Overall, do you recommend the full implementation of this new interview process?
15. Please add any additional comments.

Consultant Selection Interview Process Pilot Program Feedback

List of Projects / Interviews held as part of Pilot Program

Interviews	Date	Project No.	Location
1 st Set	12/10/03	IM-NH-15-6(149)245E	I-15 Corridor, Santaquin to Salt Lake County
2 nd Set	2/6/04	SP-0089(87)316E	State Street, 8000 S. to 7800 S., TRAX Bridge
3 rd Set	2/12/04	SP-0010(21)64E	Corridor Study on SR-10, Stake Farm Road to SR-6
4 th Set	3/18/04	STP-0012(8)60E	SR-12, Escalante to Boulder

UDOT collected feedback from participants in the Consultant Selection Interview Process Pilot Program both Selection Team members and consultants. Following is a summary of the feedback and the detailed feedback received.

Summary – Feedback Responses

Question 4 – *Please rate in general on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the best or excellent, this new process.*

Avg = 8.4

Question 5 – *Is the new process easy to use and understand? (Score 0-10)*

Avg = 8.4

Question 6 – *Were you given enough training on the new process before or while you were going through it? (Score 0-10)*

Avg = 8.2

Question 7 – *What do you think is the largest stumbling block in this new process?*

Responses were varied.

Question 8 – *Do you think including the scores of Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's) as a percentage of the final score is appropriate?*

Predominately the answer is "Yes".

Question 9 – *Do you think 30% is the appropriate weight for the SOQ's? If not, what percentage do you recommend?*

Some recommend a higher percentage and some lower, but for the most part it averages out to 30%.

Question 10 – *Do you think the opportunity to Consultants to give a Short Presentation is a positive? Did it help you decide which Consultant is the best qualified?*

Majority says "Yes". Some suggested 5 minutes is too short.

Question 11 – *Do you think allowing visual aids in the interviews is a positive? Do you recommend continuing to allow it?*

Yes, Yes

Question 12 – *Do you think scoring each Consultant's answers is an improvement over the Choosing-By-Advantage method? If not, what other scoring method do you recommend?*

Yes

Question 13 – *What changes or improvements do you recommend, if any?*

Recommended more training on process, refining of rules for visual aids, being sure consultants have enough time for each question.

Question 14 – *Overall, do you recommend the full implementation of this new interview process?*

Yes

Question 15 – *Please add any additional comments.*

Mostly Gaye's fan club somehow managed to sneak their comments in.

Detail – Feedback Responses

Question 4 – *Please rate in general on a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the best or excellent, this new process.*

1st (Feedback after 1st Set of Interviews)

- 8
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 9
- 9
- 8
- 8

2nd (Feedback after 2nd Set of Interviews)

- 8
- 8 – Wasn't involved in the previous project
- 9
- 8
- 9
- 9
- 9
- 8
- 9
- 8

3rd (Feedback after 3rd Set of Interviews)

- 8
- 8
- 10
- 8
- 9
- 8
- 8
- 9

4th (Feedback after 4th Set of Interviews)

- 9
- 8
- 8
- 9
- 9.5
- 7.56

- 9
- 7

Question 5 – *Is the new process easy to use and understand?*
(Score 0-10)

1st

- 8
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 9
- 9
- 8 (I thought the scoring of questions was much easier than before. I think that having a spreadsheet ready to go for all scoring of questions for eligible judges with all interviewees and question would be beneficial. Also, strengths and weakness columns by question might work.)
- 10

2nd

- 8
- 8 yes
- 10
- 8
- 9
- 9
- 10
- 7
- 9
- I feel it is easy to understand except for the handouts. It seems that consultants try to put as much information as possible in the handouts, but there really is no time to use them.

3rd

- 8
- 8
- 9
- 9
- 9
- 8
- 9
- 9

4th

- 9, process is smooth
- 7

- 8
- 5
- 9.5
- Yes, mostly, 7.56
- 9
- 8

Question 6 – *Were you given enough training on the new process before or while you were going through it? (Score 0-10)*

1st

- 7
- 10
- No Score
- 8
- 9
- 9
- 10
- 10
- 7 (I think going thru an example of the actual scoring would be beneficial, e.g. question 1, firm a vs firm b, firm a answer – strengths and weaknesses, firm b answers strengths and weaknesses.)
- 8

2nd

- 6
- 3 before and 9 during
- 9
- 8
- 9
- 8
- 8
- 8
- 5
- Only because I attended the training at the conference.

3rd

- 7
- 7
- 9
- 9
- 8
- 5
- 9
- 9

4th

- 10

- 8
- 9
- 5
- 9.5
- Yes, mostly, 7.56
- 9
- 9

Question 7 – *What do you think is the largest stumbling block in this new process?*

1st

- I think consultants are somewhat limited in what and how much they can present (short presentation)
- Short Presentation and consensus scoring
- Scoring
- Awkward in summing scores. Need to define and prepare forms.
- Getting use to it, scoring the interview
- Have everything set up electronically before the scoring.
- Time commitment
- Subs interviewing with more than one team was a little awkward.
- Presentation time was too short to glean much out of, I believe handouts should match boards and not be supplements to the proposal.
- No stumbling blocks were encountered.

2nd

- I didn't see one, but his being my first one, I didn't know what to look for.
- Consultants perceptions regarding their and others strengths & weaknesses
- Time constraints on the Selection Team
- N/A
- Initial scoring of SOQ's is very subjective, would be better to have set point values for specific items – would cut down on review time
- I don't know. It seems that the process is more straightforward than the old.

3rd

- Requiring consultants to do so much work when they may not get the project
- Almost too much info to process
- Not having an idea where to start with first rating
- Time everyone has to commit with understanding of busy schedules
- Inconsistency on procedures, for example in one interview the selection team was given option of releasing the team weaknesses and strengths and in another the team selected not to release them. It is helpful to know if you have made in to the interview, what you need to improve upon.
- N/A
- N/A

4th

- None

- If you score with whole numbers, it really can skew points. Let people know they can score to nearest tenth.
- Difficulty in coming up with constructive accurate comments
- Familiarity with process
- A bit more training, scoping, need to re-categorize scorekeeping
- N/A
- None

Question 8 – *Do you think including the scores of Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's) as a percentage of the final score is appropriate?*

1st

- No – I would rather have SOQ be pass/fail to move on to presentations.
- Yes
- Yes, yes, yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- I think it is appropriate.
- Yes
- Yes

2nd

- Yes
- Yes it is important to see their level of preparation for both processes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- I am not sure. On one hand, we should only use the interview since, obviously, the SOQ was what got them there in the first place. On the other hand, it could help to break ties or close scores.
- Yes
- Yes, the other way is ok with me, also
- Yes. However, the appropriate percentage may be the debate.

3rd

- Yes, absolutely
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, I think some percentage of the overall score should include the SOQ. A lot of time and effort is put into putting them together.
- Yes
- Yes

4th

- Yes, a lot of time and effort went into the SOQ and should be important
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

Question 9 – *Do you think 30% is the appropriate weight for the SOQ's? If not, what percentage do you recommend?*

1st

- Pass/fail would eliminate SOQ weight
- Certainly not more
- Yes
- Yes
- Maybe 25%
- OK
- Seemed to work OK
- Yes
- I think 30% is OK, almost on the high end. I might want to look at 25%.
- 30% is appropriate
- Higher would be better, possibly 40%

2nd

- I think it is appropriate
- More like 50% for the SOQ's
- Appropriate
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Maybe a little less – 20%
- Yes
- Yes, in some cases, it would be ok for SOQ to have more or less weight depending on circumstances
- I would recommend 20% or below. If the teams are short-listed then the review team feels there were qualified. However, because a team may not be the most dynamic interviewers, the proposal should be worth a portion of the score.

3rd

- 70%
- I think it could be a little higher – maybe 50%
- No
- Okay
- Seems OK

- 30% is probably appropriate, however, I thought that 20% for the short presentation was pretty big in comparison to the SOQ.
- I think a range of 30-40 is reasonable. The key is clear communication and process consistency, I think.
- I think 30% is certainly fair. Maybe a higher percentage (40%) would inspire the consultants to “raise the bar” for the SOQ process while not allowing a soft proposal with a strong interview team to win the project.

4th

- Yes
- Yes, if anything the % could go up, maybe 40%
- Yes
- Yes, 30% is fair
- Yes
- I had more time to think about this. I ran some “what if” scenarios, and concluded that you’ve got a good balance of weighting; i.e., in our case this time (2 points down coming in, not uncommon I would think; and a significant gap in the presentation score), it would have taken only a modest improvement in both the presentation and the Q&A to keep us competitive. I think that is a fair opportunity to “reverse” the SOQ decision.
- Yes

Question 10 – *Do you think the opportunity to Consultants to give a Short Presentation is a positive? Did it help you decide which Consultant is the best qualified?*

1st

- It’s positive, but I think it is too short.
- Maybe we should give more direction how to use it but it was helpful to me
- Yes, I would not mind letting them talk a little longer and having it count for more.
- Yes, yes
- It’s okay, NO
- Yes, yes
- It’s a positive, helped clarify each group’s overall proposal
- It is OK, but did not really add much.
- I liked the concept of having consultants present, I thought it was way too short (15 minutes seems better). Did it help you decide which Consultant is the best qualified? With only 5 minutes it did not help me select. However, one firm introduced a very competent person to the selection team, and that person shined. Perhaps we need to make sure that all selection team members are on the same page on what we can score points for. E.g. Do we want to give firms a better score for introducing a new person to the crowd that is extremely competent, rather than a firm that has the same extremely competent level person that is known.
- Too short

2nd

- Yes, I think the Short Presentation was positive. It gave me more depth and knowledge about the teams involved

- Yes – it is a positive. Important to see their ability to present in a formal situation.
- Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, it puts them on the spot – you get to see them working under pressure on their feet.
- Yes, good idea. I think it sets the tone for the interview
- Yes – It set the tone for the rest of the interview
- Yes, Yes
- Yes from a consultant's point of view. I think it gives us the opportunity to introduce our key points rather than trying to answer these during some questions that may or may not be related.

3rd

- Yes, the presentation reinforced the written proposal and showed their understanding of the project
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, it helps to see how the project might be conducted
- Yes, it does provide a nice transition into the question and answers time and allows the consultant to explain what they feel are the most important points.
- I think it is a good idea, as long as it remains short.
- Yes, because it allows the consultant team to demonstrate their understanding of the project to the selection team (eg. You will know if the team has completed their homework on the project). 15-minutes is about the right length.

4th

- Yes, the two firms were different in the Short Presentation.
- Yes
- Yes, Yes, I think we would of come up with the same answer anyway but the Short Presentation really showed us the strengths of the PM's
- Yes
- Yes, yes
- Helpful, yes
- Yes
- *The 10-minute presentation has no real structure. The consultant is left to guess what the interview team wants to hear. I think it would be difficult for the interview team to give a fair comparison. In addition, this does require the consultant to spend about 30% more time and cost to prepare for the presentation. I prefer just the questions and answer format.

Question 11 – *Do you think allowing visual aids in the interviews is a positive? Do you recommend continuing to allow it?*

1st

- Yes, maybe even more
- Yes, yes
- Yes, I would not mind letting them use the computer.

- Yes, yes
- Yes, yes
- Yes, yes
- No strong feeling either way
- Yes it was a positive, I would continue allowing them.
- I liked it more for the interaction and comfort level than the product.
- Yes, I think visual aids help the process.

2nd

- Yes, Yes
- Yes – handouts should match visual aids
- Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Somewhat – the boards are questionable – but it helps the consultant look at a board instead of buried in a small sheet
- Yes – continue. Helps with presentation
- Yes – too many handouts
- Yes, Yes
- The three boards only and no handout.

3rd

- The boards were okay but the handouts were worthless – no time to review or the intro presentation or questions
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- Yes, Yes
- It helps the consultant provide a visual representation of the points they need to address. Also, helps provide visual information about the project (i.e. map of area - location of specific items)
- Yes, if presenters use them correctly.
- Yes, because you will see first hand how well the teams present information (eg. Will they be able to relate to the audience?) I would recommend continuation of this practice.

4th

- Yes, they were useful.
- Yes
- Yes, yes
- Yes, allowed for more relaxed environment
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- See * comment above [in question 10, 4th Interview]

Question 12 – *Do you think scoring each Consultant's answers is an improvement over the Choosing-By-Advantage method? If not, what other scoring method do you recommend?*

1st

- Yes
- I like it. Arriving at a consensus score is difficult but a good process.
- Yes
- Not sure if better or not, (review for ease of use)
- Yes
- Yes
- I liked it.
- Yes, much better!
- I thought it was way easier to score accurately and quickly!!

2nd

- This is the only one I've been involved in
- Yes – scoring is much more intuitive and natural. I haven't been involved before so it's difficult to judge
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- N/A – didn't know other
- Yes – much more straightforward process
- No comment. Lack of comparative experience.
- Yes. I think in CBA, consultants would try to make points that would give them an advantage, but may have not been the correct answer. I can think of interviews where one concept was stated by a consultant and was not an advantage, but the advantage suggested by the other consultant was not accurate. At the time of scoring, the review team may not have the correct answer.

3rd

- Yes, I never understood Choosing-by-Advantage
- Never have used CBA
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Not involved in previous selection, so I can not make a comparison.
- Not qualified to comment on this.
- Since this was my first interview, I have no way to make the comparison.

4th

- Yes
- Never did CBA for consultant selection
- Yes
- Yes!

- Yes, definite improvement
- Yes, a lot, selections done as well, but 1-2 hours less time at a minimum
- In reviewing the selection team's input, I think Q&A is a great way to cover a range of items – and to get a feel for the team's dynamic.

Question 13 – *What changes or improvements do you recommend, if any?*

1st

- Longer short presentation – even more visual aids
- Maybe allow more consultant staff on projects this large.
- Went well
- Allow business casual attire
- Don't need to interview ALL SOQ applicants
- More time between interview at least 20 minutes for discussion and scoring.
- I recommend we look at tweaking it before full implementation.
 - Presentations – 0 or 15 minutes
 - Handouts must match boards or be eliminated
 - Use of the pre-prepared spreadsheet to get all the scores, discuss strengths and weaknesses, and then "COLLABORATIVE" score. We did this but it took us some time to get there, I think making that part of the plan for scoring would be beneficial.
- No changes recommended

2nd

- None
- Can the team meet prior to reviewing any SOQ's to get general issues in the open and then start the scoring and rating after
- Keeping the scoring process pure in the short-listing selection.
- Minimize handouts
- None
- Less weight on SOQ
- Fewer handouts allowed
- None
- I think the timed questions are difficult for many. It may penalize those that have a difficult time thinking quickly. I would refer to them as key technical people that may fully understand the solutions, but may have a difficult time presenting under a strict time limit.

I do however feel that the timed questions result in a more honest answer. If you have the questions early, you can prepare a canned answer. My suggestion is matching the interview length to give 10 minutes per question. The last interview we had approximately 6 minutes per questions and it was difficult to formulate a technical answer to a complex question in 6 minutes.

3rd

- Reduce discussion on each question, do overall as discussion – Became general on almost every question.
- None

- Let's give this a go for awhile and see if there are some inherent problems we can't see now
- Time notification – good on questions, bad on presentation
- None
- None
- None

4th

- Explaining scoring process better
- None
- None
- Final Score Table (Base 100)
- None

Question 14 – Overall, do you recommend the full implementation of this new interview process?

1st

- Yes
- I think we should choose from SOQ's where possible.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, but test a bit more first
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- I really liked scoring the questions and not coming up with strengths and trying to match the questions up with categories.
- Yes

2nd

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes.

3rd

- Yes, I think it is a better method – when decision from RFP is too close to be a clear choice
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Absolutely

- Yes
- I certainly think it has merit. If the weight of feedback is encouraging, I would support its implementation.
- Yes, I enjoyed the process and felt that it was very fair.

4th

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Despite our disappointment, I think we were treated fairly, and UDOT selected for the characteristics/qualifications that were valued the most.

Question 15 – *Please add any additional comments.*

1st

- I think consultants who advance to interviews should always know where they are in the pecking order and what the spread from high to low is.
- Gaye very helpful, did a good job. (Thanks.)
- On these long ones – having lunch provided was a good decision.
- I believe we need to take a strong look thru ACEC on allowing a person to attend two interviews by two opposing firms (appearance of credibility is on the line).
- I feel the interview questions need to be more focused. It seems UDOT was looking for specific responses with general questions. The Q&A would be more beneficial and more comparable between consultants if more focused questions were asked.
- Selection Team was too large.

2nd

- It went very well. You did a great job Gaye.
- Good job with the prep and scoring materials. Good job keeping process moving and getting comments recorded as they were said.
- Up front discussion & scoring guidelines
- Great Job!
- Gaye Hettrick was a pleasure to work with very well organized and led the effort exceptionally well
- Much better than the old system.
- None
- My only other comment is on the fixed questions. Along with the fixed questions, I think there should be a time that the review panel can ask specific questions for clarifications on the proposal. This may be the last part just prior to the summation. There may have been a statement that could use some follow-up to see if the team is the best qualified.

3rd

- During the scoring process the spreadsheet was confusing – trying to follow to get question and answer lined up and in sequence.
- Gaye is great!

- Good process
- Gaye did a great job in conducting/organizing the interview. I would encourage UDOT to select consultants from the SOQ.
- Very professional and objective. I have participated in a lot of federal procurement processes, and I found yours to be a good balance of professionalism without being overly stifling.
- I thought that the process was thorough and complete, and that the interview team was very professional. I appreciate the objectivity demonstrated during the interview.

4th

- None
- I really appreciate hearing the outcome within a few hours.

Date?

Short-Listed Consultants?

Address?

Re: Consultant Selection Interviews

Project No. ?

Location

Dear Mr./Ms. ?:

Congratulations! The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Selection Team has short-listed your firm for an interview on the above project. UDOT short-listed a total of # firms based on the UDOT Selection Team's scores of consultant Statements of Qualifications (SOQ).

I am enclosing a copy of the compiled scores and comments from the Selection Team members on your firm's SOQ. Keep in mind while reviewing the comments, Team members submit these comments individually prior to the Selection Team Meeting. Therefore, there may be duplicate and/or contradictory comments based on each Team member's opinion.

UDOT Consultant Selection – Interview Process Pilot Program

In April of 2003, UDOT developed a new consultant selection interview process and will be testing it under a Pilot Program over the next year for consultant selections. As UDOT will be using this new process during this consultant selection, you may want to refer to the UDOT Web site

udot.utah.gov/esd/ConsultantServices/Memos/CSInterviewPilotProgram.pdf for additional information on the Pilot Program.

Interview Schedule & Location

The interviews will be conducted on Day & Date in the ? Conference Room of the Calvin Rampton Complex, 4501 South 2700 West, Salt Lake City. Picture identification is required to gain access to the building. Following is the schedule.

Firm A 9:00 a.m.

Firm B 10:30 a.m.

Firm C 12:00 p.m.

Standard Interview Format

We request each short-listed consultant comply with the following.

- Up to five key consultant personnel are allowed to attend the interview, one of which must be the Consultant Project Manager.
- Principals of a company are not allowed to attend the interview unless they are a key person on the project.
- Individuals may only interview on one Consultant Team.
- Each consultant attendee should have a visible name identification tag.
- Each consultant will be given the time indicated below for each segment of the interview and no longer.
- Consultants will not be given the questions in advance of the interview.
- All consultants will be asked the same questions.
- Statement of Qualifications scores will be weighted at 30% of the final consultant selection scores.

Project-Specific Interview Format

Each interview will have the following project-specific format.

<u>Interview Segment</u>	<u>Time Allotted</u>
Introduction	5 minutes
Consultant Short Presentation	??? minutes
Question & Answer	??? minutes
Consultant Summation & Comment	5 minutes
Total	??? minutes

Introduction Segment

During the first five minutes of the interview, the format of the interview will be reviewed and **short** introductions (statement of name and title) of the Selection Team and Consultant Team will be performed.

Short Presentation Segment

UDOT is requesting each short-listed consultant prepare a #? minute presentation regarding the project, why your firm is the best qualified to perform the work, and/or the topic of your choice.

Question & Answer Segment

The UDOT Selection Team will then ask the same #? questions of all consultants regarding the following topics:

- Topic 1;
- Topic 2, etc.

Each question has been given a weight. Consultants' responses to each question will be scored.

Consultant Summation & Comment Segment

Each consultant will have five (5) minutes to wrap-up their interview with a summation and any comments.

Firm

Date

Page 3 of 3

Visual Aids During Interview

Consultants will be allowed to use the following visual aids during the interview:

- No visual aids;
- Use of whiteboard;
- May refer Selection Team members to graphics from your Statement of Qualifications;
- Up to #? pre-prepared presentation boards of the standard size of 24" x 36".
 - UDOT will provide easels for the display boards.
 - If you choose to bring boards, please duplicate the information in a handout. Information in the handouts is limited to the duplication of the boards.
 - You may not bring additional boards even if you only use #?.

Final Selection – Weights/Score

Statement of Qualifications Score	30% of Final Score
-----------------------------------	--------------------

Short Presentation	?% of Final Score
--------------------	-------------------

Question & Answer and Summation & Comment	?% of Final Score
---	-------------------

For an example of the new scoring method, please reference the above listed UDOT Web site.

We look forward to seeing you on **Date?**. If you have any questions in the meantime, please feel free to contact me at 801-965-4639 or ghettrick@utah.gov.

Sincerely,

Gaye Hettrick, CPM
RFQ Contract Specialist

Enclosure

cc: **PM?**, Project Manager
Project File

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

Project Number: _____

Name / Location of Project: _____

The Utah Department of Transportation Selection Team (Team) has determined interviews are necessary prior to selecting a consultant for the above project. This form will assist the Team in determining the format of these interviews.

Date & Location of Interview:

Interviews will be held starting at _____ (*time*) on _____ (*date*), at _____ (*location*).

Short-listed Firms:

The Department will be interviewing the following firms (two to five):

List Firms

- (*Firm A*) _____
- (*Firm B*) _____
- (*Firm C*) _____
- (*Firm D*) _____
- (*Firm E*) _____

Format:

The following items are standard in consultant selection interviews.

- Up to five key consultant personnel are allowed to attend the interview, one of which must be the Consultant Project Manager.
- Principals of a company are not allowed to attend the interview unless they are a key person on the project.
- Individuals may only interview on one Consultant Team.
- Each consultant attendee should have a visible name identification tag.
- Consultants will not be given the questions in advance of the interview.
- All consultants will be asked the same questions.
- Each consultant interview will be a maximum of 60 minutes including presentation, question and answer, and summation and comment periods.

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

- The consultant will be given five (5) minutes at the end of the interview for summation and comment.

Short Presentation - Optional:

Do you want consultants to prepare a Short Presentation on their qualifications/approach to the project? _____ (Yes / No)

Time Lengths and Sequence of Interviews:

List time lengths for each section of the interview. The times should correspond to the weights assigned to each section. The interviews will be conducted in the sequence order listed below.

Minutes

- _____ (0, 10, or 15 min.) Short Presentation – Optional
- _____ (40 – 55 min.) Question and Answer period
- 5 min (5 min.) Consultant Summation and Comment period
- 60 min Total (60 min. maximum)

Visual Aids:

Determine what level of visual aids consultants will be allowed to use during their Interview.

- ☐ No visual aids
- ☐ Use of whiteboard
- ☐ Consultant may refer Selection Team to graphics from Consultant's Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)
- ☐ _____ (0 - 3) Pre-prepared presentation boards
(Boards will be a standard size of 24" x 36")
(If decide to allow pre-prepared boards, then Consultants must duplicate boards in handouts. Handouts are limited to duplication of boards.)

Final Selection Score - Weights:

Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's) are now part of the final scoring. Please enter weights you want assigned to the following. Weights should correspond to the time allowed for each section. (Note: Consultant Summation and Comment Section is considered part of the Question and Answer Period for scoring purposes.)

- 30 % SOQ is 30 % of final score
- _____ (Short Presentation weight, range 0 - 20 % of final score)
- _____ (Question and Answer period weight, range 50 – 70 % of final score)
- 100 % Total

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

Release of Information to Consultants:

All consultants who submitted an SOQ will be told the scores they received on their SOQ's and the first ranked consultant's scores. The short-listed consultants will also be told the SOQ scores for other short-listed consultants.

Do you wish the Strengths & Weaknesses you observed in the consultants' SOQ's released to consultants prior to the interviews? _____ (Yes / No) If no, then the information will not be released until after the interviews.

Develop Topics for Questions:

List possible topics of questions you may be asking. Consultants will be given the topics of the questions in advance of the interviews. Giving the topics to consultants assists them in determining which five key personnel to bring to the interviews.

- (Topic) _____
- (Topic) _____
- (Topic) _____
- (Topic) _____
- (Topic) _____

Develop Questions:

All consultants will be asked the same questions. The recommended number of questions is between 3 and 7, dependent on time allowed for this section. From questions asked in the past, you can estimate each question and the Consultant's response will take approximately 7-8 minutes. Once the questions are developed, you will need to assign a weight to each question between 1 and 4 and to the Summation and Comment period between 0 and 2. The total weight for the Question & Answer and Summation & Comment Section is ten.

- | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Questions (3-7)</u> |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| • _____ | 1. _____

_____ |

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

• _____ 2. _____

• _____ 3. _____

• _____ 4. _____

• _____ 5. _____

• _____ 6. _____

• _____ 7. _____

• _____ Consultant Summation and Comment

10 Total

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection Reviewer Scores

Purpose for this Worksheet

The purpose of this worksheet is as a tool for the Selection Team to come to a consensus on scores. The Reviewers' Scores and Avg Scores are only intended to be a starting point in developing the Consensus Scores.

Confidentiality

Since the Reviewers' Scores and Avg. Scores are only intended to be a starting point in developing the Consensus Score, this worksheet and the averaged scores are confidential and will not be released to consultants.

Reviewers' Scores

Range 0 - 10, 10 = Extraordinary, 9 = Excellent, 8 = Very Good, 7 = Good, 6 = Average, 5 = Acceptable, 4 = Barely Acceptable, 3 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor, 0 = Non-existent

Reviewers' scores are tentative scores reviewers note down during the interview. The Selection Team determines the official score by consensus as a group.

Consensus Scores

The Consensus Scores are the official scores of the Selection Team and are determined as a group. They are in red.

Short Presentation	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
Reviewer Scores

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question One	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Two	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
Reviewer Scores

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Three	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Four	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
 Reviewer Scores

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Five	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Six	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
Reviewer Scores

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Seven	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Eight	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
 Reviewer Scores

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Nine	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Question Ten	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
 Reviewer Scores

Weight = 0	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
Summation & Comment	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1					
Reviewer 2					
Reviewer 3					
Reviewer 4					
Reviewer 5					
Reviewer 6					
Reviewer 7					
Reviewer 8					
Reviewer 9					
Reviewer 10					
Reviewer 11					
Reviewer 12					
Reviewer 13					
Reviewer 14					
Avg Score	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Avg Rank	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Consensus Score					
Consensus Rank	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection Interview Scores

Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's)

SOQ's	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C	Firm D	Firm E
		Points	Points	Points	Points	Points
Total	100					

Points

Range 0 -100, Points are determined by averaging individual Selection Team members' scores prior to the Selection Team Meeting.

Short Presentation Section - Optional

Presentation	Pres. Weight	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A		Firm B		Firm C		Firm D		Firm E	
			Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points
Total	10	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Score

Range 0 - 10, 10 = Extraordinary, 9 = Excellent, 8 = Very Good, 7 = Good, 6 = Average, 5 = Acceptable, 4 = Barely Acceptable, 3 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 1 = Unacceptable, 0 = Non-existent

Selection Team determines scores by consensus after interviews.

Points

Range 0 - 100, "Points" = "Presentation Weight" x "Score"

Question and Answer Section

Question	Question Weight	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A		Firm B		Firm C		Firm D		Firm E	
			Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points
Question 1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 2		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summation & Comment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Avg/Total	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

Weights of Questions and Summation & Comment

Range 0 - 4, Total of 10, 0 = Question was not asked, 4 = Vital question, Selection Team determines weights during the Selection Team Meeting.

Score

Range 0 - 10, 10 = Extraordinary, 9 = Excellent, 8 = Very Good, 7 = Good, 6 = Average, 5 = Acceptable, 4 = Barely Acceptable, 3 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor, 0 = Non-existent

Selection Team determines scores by consensus after interviews.

Points

Range 0 - 100, "Points" = "Question Weight" x "Score"

Avg

Range 0 - 10, Average of "Score" of questions, for information only.

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection Final Scores

Weights

Elements	Percentage of Final Score*	Maximum Points Possible	Weight**
SOQ's	30	100	0.30
Presentation		100	0.00
Q & A and S & C		100	0.00

Ranges

* Presentation Range = 0 - 20%, Question & Answer and Summation & Comment Range = 50 - 70%

** Presentation Range = 0 - 0.2, Question & Answer and Summation & Comment Range = 0.5 - 0.7

Final Scores

Element	Weight	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A		Firm B		Firm C		Firm D		Firm E	
			Points	Weighted Points	Points	Weighted Points	Points	Weighted Points	Points	Weighted Points	Points	Weighted Points
SOQ's	0.30	30	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Presentation	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Q & A and S & C	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Final Ranking / Score		30	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00

Weighted Points

"Weighted Points" = "Weight" x "Points"

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

Project Number: Example

Name / Location of Project: _____

The Utah Department of Transportation Selection Team (Team) has determined interviews are necessary prior to selecting a consultant for the above project. This form will assist the Team in determining the format of these interviews.

Date & Location of Interview:

Interviews will be held starting at _____ (time) on _____ (date), at _____ (location).

Short-listed Firms:

The Department will be interviewing the following firms (two to five):

List Firms

- (Firm A) Firm A
- (Firm B) Firm B
- (Firm C) Firm C
- (Firm D) _____
- (Firm E) _____

Format:

The following items are standard in consultant selection interviews.

- Up to five key consultant personnel are allowed to attend the interview, one of which must be the Consultant Project Manager.
- Principals of a company are not allowed to attend the interview unless they are a key person on the project.
- Individuals may only interview on one Consultant Team.
- Each consultant attendee should have a visible name identification tag.
- Consultants will not be given the questions in advance of the interview.
- All consultants will be asked the same questions.
- Each consultant interview will be a maximum of 60 minutes including presentation, question and answer, and summation and comment periods.

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

- The consultant will be given five (5) minutes at the end of the interview for summation and comment.

Short Presentation - Optional:

Do you want consultants to prepare a Short Presentation on their qualifications/approach to the project? Yes (Yes / No)

Time Lengths and Sequence of Interviews:

List time lengths for each section of the interview. The times should correspond to the weights assigned to each section. The interviews will be conducted in the sequence order listed below.

Minutes

- 10 min (0, 10, or 15 min.) Short Presentation – Optional
- 45 min (40 – 55 min.) Question and Answer period
- 5 min (5 min.) Consultant Summation and Comment period
- 60 min Total (60 min. maximum)

Visual Aids:

Determine what level of visual aids consultants will be allowed to use during their Interview.

- ☐ No visual aids
- ❖ Use of whiteboard
- ❖ Consultant may refer Selection Team to graphics from Consultant's Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)
- ❖ 3 (0 - 3) Pre-prepared presentation boards
(Boards will be a standard size of 24" x 36")
(If decide to allow pre-prepared boards, then Consultants must duplicate boards in handouts. Handouts are limited to duplication of boards.)

Final Selection Score - Weights:

Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's) are now part of the final scoring. Please enter weights you want assigned to the following. Weights should correspond to the time allowed for each section. (Note: Consultant Summation and Comment Section is considered part of the Question and Answer Period for scoring purposes.)

- 30 % SOQ is 30 % of final score
- 10 % (Short Presentation weight, range 0 - 20 % of final score)
- 60 % (Question and Answer period weight, range 50 – 70 % of final score)
- 100 % Total

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

Release of Information to Consultants:

All consultants who submitted an SOQ will be told the scores they received on their SOQ's and the first ranked consultant's scores. The short-listed consultants will also be told the SOQ scores for other short-listed consultants.

Do you wish the Strengths & Weaknesses you observed in the consultants' SOQ's released to consultants prior to the interviews? No (Yes / No) If no, then the information will not be released until after the interviews.

Develop Topics for Questions:

List possible topics of questions you may be asking. Consultants will be given the topics of the questions in advance of the interviews. Giving the topics to consultants assists them in determining which five key personnel to bring to the interviews.

- (Topic) Topic 1
- (Topic) Topic 2
- (Topic) Topic 3
- (Topic) Topic 4
- (Topic) Topic 5

Develop Questions:

All consultants will be asked the same questions. The recommended number of questions is between 3 and 7, dependent on time allowed for this section. From questions asked in the past, you can estimate each question and the Consultant's response will take approximately 7-8 minutes. Once the questions are developed, you will need to assign a weight to each question between 1 and 4 and to the Summation and Comment period between 0 and 2. The total weight for the Question & Answer and Summation & Comment Section is ten.

- | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Questions (3-7)</u> |
|----------------|--|
| • <u> 2 </u> | 1. <u> Question One </u>

_____ |

UDOT Consultant Selection Team Interview Format Worksheet Form

•	<u>1.5</u>	2.	<u>Question Two</u>	
•	<u>1.5</u>	3.	<u>Question Three</u>	
•	<u>2</u>	4.	<u>Question Four</u>	
•	<u>3</u>	5.	<u>Question Five</u>	
•	<u>0</u>	6.	<u>N/A</u>	
•	<u>0</u>	7.	<u>N/A</u>	
•	<u>0</u>	Consultant Summation and Comment		
	<u>10</u>	Total		

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection Reviewer Scores

Purpose for this Worksheet

The purpose of this worksheet is as a tool for the Selection Team to come to a consensus on scores. The Reviewers' Scores and Avg Scores are only intended to be a starting point in developing the Consensus Scores.

Confidentiality

Since the Reviewers' Scores and Avg. Scores are only intended to be a starting point in developing the Consensus Score, this worksheet and the averaged scores are confidential and will not be released to consultants.

Reviewers' Scores

Range 0 - 10, 10 = Extraordinary, 9 = Excellent, 8 = Very Good, 7 = Good, 6 = Average, 5 = Acceptable, 4 = Barely Acceptable, 3 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor, 0 = Non-existent

Reviewers' scores are tentative scores reviewers note down during the interview. The Selection Team determines the official score by consensus as a group.

Consensus Scores

The Consensus Scores are the official scores of the Selection Team and are determined as a group. They are in red.

Short Presentation	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1	9	8	7
Reviewer 2	8	7	8
Reviewer 3	9.5	8	8
Reviewer 4	8.5	8.5	7
Reviewer 5	9	9.5	7
Reviewer 6	8	8	7
Avg Score	8.67	8.17	7.33
Avg Rank	1	2	3
Consensus Score	8.50	8.00	7.00
Consensus Rank	1	2	3

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
 Reviewer Scores

Weight = 2	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
Question One	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1	7	8	8
Reviewer 2	7.5	8	9
Reviewer 3	8	7	7
Reviewer 4	9	8	8.5
Reviewer 5	8.5	8.5	9
Reviewer 6	5	7	9
Avg Score	7.50	7.75	8.42
Avg Rank	3	2	1
Consensus Score	7.00	8.00	9.00
Consensus Rank	3	2	1

Weight = 1.5	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
Question Two	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1	8	7	8
Reviewer 2	9	8	9
Reviewer 3	6	5	4
Reviewer 4	9	9	9
Reviewer 5	8	7	8
Reviewer 6	7	6	7
Avg Score	7.83	7.00	7.50
Avg Rank	1	3	2
Consensus Score	8.00	7.00	9.00
Consensus Rank	2	3	1

Weight = 1.5	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
Question Three	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1	8	8	8
Reviewer 2	7.5	7	7
Reviewer 3	8.5	8	8
Reviewer 4	9	8	7
Reviewer 5	7	8	9
Reviewer 6	7	7	7
Avg Score	7.83	7.67	7.67
Avg Rank	1	2	2
Consensus Score	8.00	7.50	7.50
Consensus Rank	1	2	2

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection
 Reviewer Scores

Weight = 2	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
Question Four	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1	6	9	9
Reviewer 2	8	9	8
Reviewer 3	7	8	9
Reviewer 4	5	7	10
Reviewer 5	8	8	9
Reviewer 6	5	6	7
Avg Score	6.50	7.83	8.67
Avg Rank	3	2	1
Consensus Score	6.50	7.50	8.50
Consensus Rank	3	2	1

Weight = 3	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
Question Five	Score	Score	Score
Reviewer 1	8	8	9
Reviewer 2	9	8	9
Reviewer 3	7	8	9
Reviewer 4	6	5	6
Reviewer 5	8	8	9
Reviewer 6	7	8	10
Avg Score	7.50	7.50	8.67
Avg Rank	2	2	1
Consensus Score	7.50	7.50	8.50
Consensus Rank	2	2	1

Project No. <>
<Description>
<Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection Interview Scores

Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's)

SOQ's	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A	Firm B	Firm C
		Points	Points	Points
Total	100	91.02	89.66	90.05

Points

Range 0 -100, Points are determined by averaging individual Selection Team members' scores prior to the Selection Team Meeting.

Short Presentation Section - Optional

Presentation	Pres. Weight	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A		Firm B		Firm C	
			Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points
Total	10	100	8.5	85	8	80	7	70

Score

Range 0 - 10, 10 = Extraordinary, 9 = Excellent, 8 = Very Good, 7 = Good, 6 = Average, 5 = Acceptable, 4 = Barely Acceptable, 3 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor, 0 = Non-existent

Selection Team determines scores by consensus after interviews.

Points

Range 0 - 100, "Points" = "Presentation Weight" x "Score"

Question and Answer Section

Question	Question Weight	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A		Firm B		Firm C	
			Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points
Question 1	2	20	7	14	8	16	9	18
Question 2	1.5	15	8	12	7	10.5	9	13.5
Question 3	1.5	15	8	12	7.5	11.25	7.5	11.25
Question 4	2	20	6.5	13	7.5	15	8.5	17
Question 5	3	30	7.5	22.5	7.5	22.5	8.5	25.5
Avg/Total	10	100	3.36	73.5	3.41	75.25	3.86	85.25

Weights of Questions and Summation & Comment

Range 0 - 4, Total of 10, 0 = Question was not asked, 4 = Vital question, Selection Team determines weights during the Selection Team Meeting.

Score

Range 0 - 10, 10 = Extraordinary, 9 = Excellent, 8 = Very Good, 7 = Good, 6 = Average, 5 = Acceptable, 4 = Barely Acceptable, 3 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor, 0 = Non-existent

Selection Team determines scores by consensus after interviews.

Points

Range 0 - 100, "Points" = "Question Weight" x "Score"

Avg

Range 0 - 10, Average of "Score" of questions, for information only.

Project No. <>
 <Description>
 <Date>

UDOT Consultant Selection Final Scores

Weights

Elements	Percentage of Final Score*	Maximum Points Possible	Weight**
SOQ's	30	100	0.30
Presentation	10	100	0.10
Q & A and S & C	60	100	0.60

Ranges

* Presentation Range = 0 - 20%, Question & Answer and Summation & Comment Range = 50 - 70%

** Presentation Range = 0 - 0.2, Question & Answer and Summation & Comment Range = 0.5 - 0.7

Final Scores

Element	Weight	Max. Pts. Possible	Firm A		Firm B		Firm C	
			Points	Weighted Points	Points	Weighted Points	Points	Weighted Points
SOQ's	0.30	30	91.02	27.31	89.66	26.90	90.05	27.02
Presentation	0.10	10	85	8.50	80	8.00	70	7.00
Q & A and S & C	0.60	60	73.5	44.10	75.25	45.15	85.25	51.15
Final Ranking / Score		100	3	79.91	2	80.05	1	85.17

Weighted Points

"Weighted Points" = "Weight" x "Points"